DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 388 089 FL 023 340

AUTHOR	Griego-Jones, Toni
TITLE	Implementing Bilingual Programs Is Everybody's Business. Focus: Occasional Papers in Bilingual Education 11.
INSTITUTION	National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education, Washington, DC.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	95
CONTRACT	T292008001
NOTE	19p.
AVAILABLE FROM	National Clearinghouses for Bilingual Education, 1118 22nd Street N.W., Washington, DC 20037.
PUB TYPE	Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrative Organization; *Agency Cooperation; *Bilingual Education Programs; Change Strategies; Educational Change; Organizational Change; Peer Teaching; Program Administration; *Program Implementation; School Districts; *Staff Development; *Teacher Role; *Teacher Supervision

ABSTRACT

A discussion of the role of bilingual education programs focuses on their function as a district-wide or school-wide reform effort, rather than as a discrete program within a larger system. It is proposed that this approach requires changes in the traditional roles of school personnel and thoughtful attention to how to involve all participants. Recasting bilingual programs as district- or school-wide reform implies that non-bilingual personnel need to assume ownership for specific aspects of implementation, and that bilingual personnel must expand their activity into the total operations of schools and districts. A study of the perceptions of school district personnel involved in change efforts in urban schools, in which this issue emerged, is noted. Six factors identified as facilitating involvement of non-bilingual personnel in an inclusive implementation plan are outlined: (1) visible and strongly stated support from the superintendent; (2) specific and detailed guidelines for each unit in the district; (3) intensive and ongoing staff development; (4) organizational modifications; (5) use of classroom teachers as trainers; and (6) rotation of teachers in supervisory/mentor positions. Some additional considerations are discussed briefly. A bibliography is included. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 388 089

FOCUS

IMPLEMENTING BILINGUAL PROGRAMS IS EVERYBODY'S BUSINESS

Toni Griego-Jones

Occasional Papers in Bilingual Education

11

SPRING 1995

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Joel Gomez

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

FL023340

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education (NCBE) is funded by the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs (OBEMLA) and is operated under Contract No. T292008001 by The George Washington University, Graduate School of Education and Human Development, Center for Policy Studies. The contents of this publication do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the Department of Education, nor does the mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the U.S. Government. Readers are free to duplicate and use these materials in keeping with accepted publication standards. NCBE requests that proper credit be given in the event of reproduction.

Director: Joel Gómez
Series Editor: Minerva Gorena

The George Washington University
WASHINGTON DC

Implementing Bilingual Programs Is Everybody's Business

Toni Griego-Jones
University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee

Spring 1995

INTRODUCTION

In the United States today there are approximately 1,000 federally funded or private bilingual education programs in K-12 schools. Beginning in 1968 with the funding of Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, bilingual programs have spread across the country and are now institutionalized in most of the nation's largest urban school systems. They are beginning to be part of the suburban and rural educational landscapes as well. Even in states that historically had few bilingual programs, new programs are being implemented or existing ones expanded as the number of language minority students increases. With the expansion of students and programs, there is a renewed interest and need to look at how bilingual programs can be incorporated into school districts more effectively.

In general, bilingual programs have been initiated in response to community pressures, court orders, or the promise of federal and state funds. They have rarely been implemented by educators within school systems simply because they believed that bilingual programs were more effective ways of teaching students. Perhaps because of these beginnings, the programs have been considered "out of the mainstream" by educators—bilingual and non-bilingual personnel alike. This non-mainstream status may also be due to the fact that bilingual programs have served a minority of students—small numbers in some districts, large numbers in others, but still not the majority of a district's students. Further, the perception that bilingual programs are temporary, in spite of their proliferation over the last twenty-five years, is still pervasive in many school districts. The peculiarly American aversion to learning more than one language has also undoubtedly contributed to the "out-of-the-mainstream status."

Bilingual programs are often described as programs for students who are being transitioned from a state of unreadiness for the regular school program to a level of English proficiency that qualifies them to enter the real (mainstream) program. It is not unusual for bilingual teachers themselves to describe their work as preparing students for mainstream classrooms. Furthermore, programs are often evaluated on the basis of exiting students from them. Interestingly, even though most bilingual classrooms focus on transitioning students to mainstream classrooms, the mainstream teachers on the receiving end of the transition often have no knowledge of what occurs in bilingual classrooms. The majority of teachers in mainstream classrooms are monolingual and may not understand what students have experienced in learning their second language in bilingual classrooms; nor do they automatically realize their own responsibility and role in supporting the language development of incoming "exited" students. This is not surprising, given that teacher preparation programs have ignored teaching about second language learning, about the role and importance of a child's native language, or about how to teach content to students learning English as a second language.

IMPORTANCE OF INCORPORATING BILINGUAL PROGRAMS INTO THE MAINSTREAM

The isolation and consequent lack of connection between bilingual and non-bilingual programs within most designated bilingual schools is so profound that designated bilingual schools are often actually two schools housed in one building—one with a bilingual strand of classrooms and the other with "regular" classrooms. This practice of allowing bilingual programs to be discrete programs apart from the mainstream presents some serious, inherent problems.

First, it fosters alienation between bilingual teachers and the non-bilingual staff in designated bilingual schools. There are reports of bilingual teachers feeling like second class citizens within their buildings and, on the other hand, of mainstream teachers mistrusting and misunderstanding the motives and methods of bilingual teachers (Ovando and Collier, 1985). Secondly, bilingual students are deprived of the support and resources available to other students in their schools. Thirdly, the isolation and separation denies native English speakers the potential benefits of bilingual education. Fourth, the indifference or, in some cases, hostility, encountered by bilingual teachers and administrators who are attempting to implement new programs or expand older ones can effectively prevent putting them in place.

If a program cannot adequately be integrated into the system, it has very little chance of succeeding in accomplishing its instructional mission. In order to ensure the successful incorporation of the current new and expanding programs, renewed attention must be given to thoughtful planning and implementation of programs.

STATUS OF BILINGUAL PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

Until now, implementation of bilingual programs in most districts has generally been regarded as the business of designated bilingual personnel only, primarily teachers and program directors. Those not directly involved in the delivery of bilingual instruction or administration of programs have not usually taken responsibility for implementing them. Moreover, program implementation has not typically been a districtwide concern. District personnel as a whole generally do not know the program goals and needs and have not considered it part of their job to participate in the implementation of bilingual programs.

For their part, bilingual teachers and administrators too have not generally approached the task of putting bilingual programs into place as a districtwide, or even schoolwide, concern. Bilingual personnel do acknowledge the need for district- or school-level support, but it is not clear how that acknowledgment translates into specific action and responsibilities for people not in the bilingual program. The result is that bilingual program directors take on the implementation of programs as something they alone are responsible for, letting other district personnel off the hook and taking on or duplicating tasks that others are responsible for in most instances of program implementation.

A review of the literature on *implementation* of bilingual programs shows that there has been little formal study of the actual process of putting bilingual programs into place. Most research on bilingual programs has focused on determining the effectiveness of different types of programs (transitional, immersion, late exit,

and so forth) and classroom models or instructional methodologies (Ginsburg, 1992). What we know about bilingual program implementation comes primarily as a by-product of evaluation studies or from directors' progress reports (Development Associates, Inc., 1993; Lucas, Katz, and Ramage, 1992; Mertens, Bateman, and Tallmadge, 1990; Nava, Reisner, Douglas, Johnson, Morales, and Tallmadge, 1984; Pena, 1986; Ramirez, David, Yuen, Ramey, and Dena, 1991; Tallmadge, Lam, and Gamel, 1987; Willig, 1985). In these evaluations and reports, information on factors important to implementation is usually stated in terms of obstacles and barriers to effective programs or, alternatively, as facilitating factors. Briefly, the factors identified in these studies and reports as affecting implementation are:

- support and commitment from district leadership (i.e., superintendent and/or school board);
- staff development and training;
- coordination and collaboration among administrative units (bilingual program and units such as curriculum, testing, elementary and secondary instruction, human resources);
- effective communication throughout entire schools and districts;
- adequate resource allocation;
- parent/community support; and
- effective working relationships with state education agencies.

A common theme that threads through the reports is the importance of coordinating with the mainstream program to effectively garner resources and services. This coordination and collaboration is recognized as important both when it happens and when it is absent. Yet there remains a notable absence of planning for utilizing coordination as a strategy for implementation.

Other sources of information on bilingual program implementation are studies on implementing desegregation orders. In districts where bilingual programs have been part of the remedy in court judgments against school systems, documentation of the process of operationalizing court orders provides some clues about factors important in implementing bilingual programs (Baez, 1993; Crawford, 1989). Some of the same facilitating or enhancing factors found in program evaluations are also found in these studies:

- support from school boards and central offices;
- staff development and training;
- adequate resources; and
- inherent in the case for integration, communication and coordination with mainstream personnel and students.

In educational literature on change, reform, and implementation in general, the same factors (board and superintendent support, staff development, adequate resources, communication, and collaboration) have been identified repeatedly as important to incorporating new initiatives into schools or districts (Bacharach, 1990; Fullan, 1990; Sarason, 1982). Since bilingual education *is* an educational reform effort aimed at improving schooling, lessons learned from the literature on educational change and reform in general should also be used to put bilingual programs into place. For example, one significant new insight gained from attempts to improve education, especially from the unprecedented reform activity in the last decade, is the importance of a comprehensive, holistic approach to

reform and change, one that involves all stakeholders and affects all aspects of schooling (Boyer, 1990; Fullan, 1990; Martin, 1992; Schorr, 1989). This particular approach has significant implications for bilingual program implementation in that it points out the importance of inclusion. In other words, all actors in designated bilingual schools and districts with bilingual programs—including non-bilingual personnel—must be involved in the business of incorporating bilingual programs into schools or districts.

Even so, in reviewing the educational reform literature, there were relatively few studies that included bilingual programs as part of the reform movements sweeping through school systems in recent years. These few studies are part of the research on "at risk" students (Valdivieso, 1991), on achievement of Latino students, and on restructuring (Prager, 1991). However, the focus is again on classroom effectiveness, not on how programs are incorporated into school systems.

In only one instance—a study of the perceptions of school district personnel involved in change efforts in urban schools—did bilingual program implementation surface in the broader context of educational change and reform. In this study, the implementation of a bilingual program emerged as one example of change in the system. This was significant because perceptual examples were volunteered by *school district personnel*, including those not in the bilingual program, as they described their own actions and how they perceived the roles of others in implementing change. Because findings from the study support the idea that bilingual programs can be implemented with the active, conscious involvement of non-bilingual personnel as well as those working in bilingual classrooms and program administration, the study is described below.

The research was conducted in three large urban school districts in the Midwest, Southwest, and West Coast in the late 1980s. Each district had a bilingual program and a racially and ethnically diverse student population where minorities—primarily Hispanics and African Americans—comprised from 50 to 87 percent of the overall student population. Individual on-site interviews with respondents were audiotaped using a semi-structured protocol designed to elicit examples of change that had taken place in their districts as well as information about their own involvement in the changes in their school systems. Superintendents and central administrators in charge of personnel, curriculum, testing, and elementary and secondary instructional programs for each district were interviewed as well as two principals and two to four teachers in each district (Griego-Jones, 1990). Program directors of various recently initiated programs were also interviewed. Additional data were collected through observations in central administrative offices and schools and historical research. Data were analyzed qualitatively using an ethnograph computer program to determine examples and definitions of change, and commonalities and differences in concepts of change within the various levels of district personnel and between districts. The goal of the study was to gain information that would facilitate efforts to improve practice in school systems. Since the study was not focused on any particular kind of program, interviews did not ask about specific reform initiatives. Surprisingly, respondents from one district in the study identified implementation of a bilingual program as an example of district-wide change. Other examples given were initia-

tion of a new primary grades curriculum, whole language, new reading programs, desegregation orders, site-based governance, and decentralization. The bilingual program was surprising because *non-bilingual personnel* as well as the few respondents who happened to be bilingual teachers or administrators identified the bilingual expansion as an example of effective implementation and change. Their descriptions specifically give clues as to how those outside of bilingual programs can be involved in implementing them.

According to respondents, the bilingual implementation not only involved bilingual teachers and administrators, but also actively involved other people from most departments in the system, including personnel, curriculum, and testing and evaluation. The widespread involvement of parts of the system not only seemed to facilitate clearer perceptions of program implementation throughout the system, but also lent support to putting necessary pieces in place.

DEVELOPING AN INCLUSIVE IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

District personnel interviewed in the study identified six factors as facilitating involvement of non-bilingual personnel. These factors are consistent with information gleaned from bilingual program evaluations and educational reform findings in general. They are discussed below, with comments on how they facilitated involvement of personnel on a districtwide scale, along with suggestions for specific activities.

1. VISIBLE AND STRONGLY STATED SUPPORT FROM THE SUPERINTENDENT

Statements from all respondents indicated that the strong declarations of support for the bilingual program made by the superintendent were important to widespread involvement in the implementation. Central office administrators and principals especially acknowledged that the superintendent's message carried weight with them and that they knew they were expected to facilitate bilingual implementation as part of their jobs. They assumed ownership as they were directed to learn about the bilingual program and to exert leadership in implementation of various provisions of the program within their respective units.

From all the reform literature it is clear that strong and visible support from the leadership, school board, and/or superintendent, is crucial to implementation. Logically, it is also critical to involving non-bilingual personnel in the implementation of bilingual programs. It is not enough for district leaders to allow programs to exist or to accept state and federal funding for them. They must visibly, consistently, and strongly show their own commitment to putting bilingual programs in place. Further, leaders must communicate the expectation that others—central administrators, principals, and teachers—will also lend their active support to the implementation and maintenance of programs as part of their professional responsibilities.

In planning for bilingual program implementation then, think about *how* leaders in a particular district can demonstrate support through specific actions such as writing memoranda in support of specific activities, making public announcements of support, drafting letters to the community from the board and superintendent explaining program goals and strengths, and initiating and mediating meetings between bilingual administrators and

non-bilingual staff to learn about program goals and needs. Consider what would be meaningful to district personnel—what would they recognize as indicators of support for their leadership? Identify leaders who do support the bilingual program and develop a plan of action for what you want them to do. Include them in publicity and marketing campaigns to celebrate successes and promote the bilingual program. Foster relationships with the press and media within the district and surrounding area and target market audiences (e.g., parents, policy makers, teachers and teachers' unions, and support services personnel).

2. SPECIFIC AND DETAILED GUIDELINES FOR EACH UNIT IN THE DISTRICT

The court agreement in the study contained guidelines for various departments (curriculum, personnel, evaluation, and elementary and secondary instructional departments) that helped to define roles. Staff development sessions then communicated those roles to the responsible parties. The important point here is not what the provisions of the court agreement were, but that respondents believed the job of implementing the bilingual program had been facilitated by the *clearly defined* provisions for them and others. This clear understanding was a major difference between other examples of change and the implementation of the bilingual program.

All research findings suggest it is important to identify and clarify specific duties and responsibilities in implementation. In the case of bilingual programs, units like testing, evaluation, curriculum, and instruction offer mainstay services to classrooms and school buildings. Therefore, it is important to target them and make their roles clear. For example, bilingual programs have major needs in data collection, testing, and documentation. Strong alliances then, should be developed with testing and evaluation units. Time spent up front helping others to understand the program's needs (along with the leadership's statements of support) should facilitate obtaining needed resources as the program progresses. Initial planning should include identifying all units that have something to offer bilingual programs, making a checklist of what is needed from them, and planning how to approach individuals within each unit. Bilingual program personnel could even be placed as part of the implementation plan in various units, even if temporarily on special assignment or on a rotating basis.

There should also be a clear understanding between schools and central administration of expected services and of how buildings are to communicate their needs regarding their bilingual programs. Identify all incoming resources from various sources (district, state, federal, and private foundations) for students in any given building and look for the bilingual students' share. Too often, bilingual classrooms have relied on their own program budgets or Title VII funds for materials that should be provided to all children enrolled in the school district.

Another avenue for involving all district units and resources is to ensure that the bilingual program's perspective is represented in all facets of school and district governance. For example, in schools with site-based governance, bilingual teachers and parents need to be represented in proportion to their numbers in the school.

3. INTENSIVE AND ONGOING STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Staff development in the district studied included training for support staff and paraprofessionals as well as teachers, principals, and central administrators. Sessions included information about requirements mandated by the court for the program, and about first and second language acquisition theory. Some staff development sessions were open to non-bilingual teachers, when possible, and there were opportunities specifically for non-bilingual personnel to learn or improve Spanish and thereby increase the potential pool of bilingual teachers. The intensive, inclusive nature of the staff development, coupled with the publicity of the court settlement, helped make the program very visible in the district. People who had not previously attended to bilingual programs were now a part of them.

An obvious implication of the findings from the study of district personnel perspectives as well as from the broader literature is that relationships between bilingual and non-bilingual personnel need to be facilitated; they don't just happen. Opportunities need to be structured for sharing bilingual teachers' expertise and recognizing that of non-bilingual teachers. Specifically identifying what individual teachers from both groups can offer the bilingual program and the entire school could establish professional respect and cooperation and foster a climate of inclusiveness. Addressing the knowledge gap of all teachers, especially non-bilingual teachers, about second language acquisition, native language instruction, and other major components of bilingual education could facilitate total school involvement in bilingual programs. Alternatives to inservice for doing this could be classroom exchanges, joint curriculum planning, and joint planning for training other teachers.

Finally, think beyond the classroom in order to maximize support and resources. Plan staff development for all personnel, including office workers, support staff, custodians, kitchen staff, and so on. All adults in the building contribute to the climate of the school and provide services to children.

4. ORGANIZATIONAL MODIFICATIONS TO EXISTING PRACTICE

In the study, court mandated structural adaptations facilitated involvement of non-bilingual personnel by forcing changes in district processes and procedures. Some examples of organizational modifications to existing practices were:

- written job descriptions and detailed procedures for placing bilingual teachers, including testing for Spanish proficiency;
- transfer procedures for those who did not qualify for bilingual classrooms to other positions;
- adjustments to budgets for paid after-hours sessions; and
- release time for teacher participation as trainers for the new program.

Many of the adjustments necessitated communication and cooperation with the teachers' union in working out placement and transfer procedures for bilingual and mainstream teachers affected by the new program requirements. Inclusion of the union in the planning and implementation was a key factor in the relatively smooth transfer of a number of teachers within the district. The constant contact between the union and bilingual teachers was also a learning experience for both groups.

Many school districts have gone beyond making adjustments to parts of the system to full scale

restructuring. Educational reform in general is changing many accepted practices within school districts so it is an opportune time for bilingual programs to identify and make adjustments that break down barriers to successful implementation.

5. THE USE OF CLASSROOM TEACHERS AS TRAINERS

Extensive use of bilingual and non-bilingual teachers with expertise in areas like the whole language approach to teaching reading served to facilitate understanding between bilingual and non-bilingual teaching staffs within buildings, in the study cited. The use of bilingual and non-bilingual teachers with expertise in language development fostered mutual respect and had potential for creating a more collaborative climate between the two groups of teachers. Working together in planning and delivering staff development disseminated knowledge and appreciation for the work of bilingual teachers. It also lent them support as non-bilingual teachers learned more about issues related to second language learning and were, therefore, able to help educate other non-bilingual staff.

The significant involvement of classroom teachers in the example of change in the study was strikingly different from other examples cited. The utilization of both groups of teachers as staff developers has the potential to contribute greatly to participant "buy in," a factor that is widely acknowledged in research literature on educational reform as crucial to successful integration of new programs.

6. ROTATION OF TEACHERS IN SUPERVISORY POSITIONS

In the change study, teachers were not only asked to serve as trainers but also assisted in mentoring new teachers and serving as bilingual resource teachers or coordinators of various aspects of the bilingual program implementation. Without forcing teachers to leave their teaching positions, some teachers were released to assist in implementing provisions of the court order, identifying needs of new or inexperienced teachers, writing curriculum, and selecting and ordering curricular materials. Working with units throughout the district—human resources, curriculum, staff development, testing and evaluation—facilitated contact between the units and bilingual teachers and fostered better understanding of programmatic goals, needs, and instructional strategies. It also elevated the status of bilingual personnel in the eyes of central office administrators and provided teachers with opportunities to learn more about the district's administrative structure.

Finally, besides the six elements discussed above, school district personnel identified participant buy-in and time as key factors that surfaced repeatedly in the descriptions of the bilingual program implementation. Increasing the participation of more district personnel, including non-bilingual teachers and administrators, logically increases the potential for buy-in and support for bilingual programs. Maximizing the buy-in from non-bilingual as well as bilingual personnel can maximize the chances of incorporating bilingual programs into the mainstream of schools and districts.

Time to reflect and absorb change is also found to be key in allowing programs to take hold in districts. In the case of bilingual programs, there are aspects that require exceptional amounts of time. For example, it is difficult to find qualified teachers who are fluent in both languages of

instruction. It is possible to recruit and certify bilingual people as teachers, but it takes time. It is even possible for monolingual teachers to develop proficiency in English or Spanish but that also takes time and intense study to accomplish. The dual language proficiency that is a key component of bilingual programs is a time and labor intensive ingredient not present in most other reform efforts. Because it is unique, it is not always understood by those outside of bilingual programs and districts tend to abandon efforts to adequately staff programs by relying on measures like emergency licenses. A broader understanding on the part of more district personnel, including superintendents and board members, of factors like the need to develop dual language proficiency might help to obtain the necessary time to integrate programs into the system.

ADDITIONAL FACTORS

There are other factors to consider as we begin planning strategies to reorient bilingual program implementation and involve more district personnel and resources. The size of the program, that is, numbers of students in the bilingual program, numbers of schools, numbers of bilingual teaching and administrative staff, are factors that will affect the level and need for district support. For example, the relative percentage of bilingual students to the rest of the student population will make a difference in the awareness and attitudes of all personnel. In districts with very large numbers, non-bilingual personnel are likely to be aware of programs, but attention to implementation in many of the larger districts has a history of controversy that forestalls support. In districts with very small numbers on the other hand, the programs may suffer from the opposite problem, a lack of attention, that may make it equally difficult to secure resources. In one case, planning may have to attend to overcoming preconceived ideas; in the other, planning may have to educate from the beginning.

The impetus or reason for implementing or expanding the bilingual program will also have implications for its design and implementation. For example, programs resulting from court orders may have stronger backing and resources, but they may also have a history of bitterness and resistance. The past history of bilingual programs in the district will have an effect on how to approach implementation of new programs or expansion of old ones. Attitudes of hostility or mistrust are considerations that have potential for foiling the successful implementation of programs. Therefore, planning has to include attention to how to turn hostile attitudes around. For example, implementation might have to include conflict resolution, team building, and training in cooperative learning before it can attend to classroom issues.

Another consideration is that individual districts and schools have distinct needs and contexts. In education we have often tried to generalize, to disseminate effective practices, pretending that what works in one place will work in another. Research is beginning to show that, in fact, the individual contexts of reform are perhaps the most important considerations in its implementation. Many of the more effective reform efforts of the 1980s, for example, were implemented in suburban areas with middle class, non-minority students and then "applied" to urban contexts that have very different students and resources. What worked in one situation did not necessarily work in another.

Configurations of bilingual programs within districts, depending in large part on the numbers of limited English proficient (LEP) students in a district, also have implications for districtwide implementation of bilingual programs. Very large urban districts with thousands of LEP students are likely to have many schools—even a majority—with bilingual programs. For these districts, the plan for involving school district personnel and accessing district resources might include clustering schools to treat them as one unit and consolidating resources.

There is a trend toward the idea of targeting whole units, whether they be schools, clusters of schools, or whole districts, as the focus for reform. For example, some schools that used to "have" Title I programs now "are" schoolwide Title I. More and more schools are organizing around a focus or specialization, realizing that the focus lends an aspect of coherence to curriculum and instruction. For a variety of reasons, including research that illustrates the efficacy of a schoolwide approach to instruction as opposed to a fragmented programs approach, a trend toward the *schoolwide* concept is emerging (U.S. Department of Education, 1994). In the case of Title I, designating an entire school as Title I is seen as focusing resources, expertise, and instructional methods on the general population of disadvantaged students and not worrying about whether every child fits specific federal guidelines. According to an Independent Review Panel evaluating the schoolwide concept in Title I, this option promotes the kind of organizational and programmatic flexibility that allows reconfiguration of the school day, cooperation among instructional staff, control of resources, and freedom from restrictive mandates covering "minutiae of educational procedures" (U.S. Department of Education, 1994).

Applying the same logic to schools with large numbers of children from Spanish speaking homes (or any language other than English), whether the children are identified as LEP or not, should result in offering the benefits of bilingual education to all children in a given school. Utilizing both Spanish and English to teach children from Spanish speaking homes can't help but maximize their understanding of content and develop both of their languages. Spending time on developing both languages instead of worrying about whether children's test scores fall above or below a standard test score to designate them as LEP would maximize language development. Children from English speaking homes are also entitled to the opportunity to learn a second language. If the whole school was invested in dual language development as a focus, all students would benefit.

There is at least one bilingual model in which a total bilingual school focus is already feasible and in place. Two-way bilingual schools have developed a program around a schoolwide focus, that of teaching all students a second language and delivering instruction in two languages. When an entire school is designated bilingual, there is no question that all resources that normally flow from the district will be supporting implementation of the bilingual program and that all school personnel will be involved in dual language development.

Other situations in which bilingual program implementation would automatically be schoolwide are site-based management schools that have a majority of students from homes where a

language other than English is spoken. In these schools, at least theoretically, federal, state, and district resources can be used at the discretion of those within the building. If the building is predominantly composed of bilingual classrooms and staff, bilingual education should be the major component of the instructional program. Again, if the majority of students come mostly from Spanish speaking homes (although not designated as LEP) the entire school could be organized around using both languages for maximum language development.

CONCLUSIONS

Programs are in place in almost all school districts enrolling language minority children and districts with increasing numbers are beginning implementation of new programs.

Thinking of bilingual education as a *districtwide* or *schoolwide* reform effort involves changes in the traditional roles of school personnel and mandates thoughtful attention to how to involve all participants. Recasting bilingual programs as district- or schoolwide reforms implies that non-bilingual personnel need to assume ownership for specific aspects of implementation of programs. It also implies that bilingual personnel must expand their activity into the total operations of schools and districts. That this is possible was illustrated in the study reported above. That this is needed is strongly suggested by the burgeoning body of research in educational reform on the effectiveness of an integrated, comprehensive approach to initiating new programs, including bilingual programs.

In what appears to be a timely and logical progression, the newly authorized Improving America's Schools Act (IASA) of 1994 begins to redefine federally funded bilingual programs as part of systemic, districtwide, or schoolwide reform efforts. Clearly, the intent of the new legislation is to provide a direction away from the old compensatory model toward recasting bilingual programs as reform efforts that are part of a larger whole, needing resources from that whole. The challenge for bilingual educators at the school level is to reorient the *implementation* of programs in schools and districts toward a districtwide approach. This is no small task as the perception of bilingual programs as remedial, limited programs is well entrenched in school systems. A reorientation will take conscious reflective planning on the part of bilingual personnel. If we succeed in recasting bilingual education as a legitimate educational reform that requires planning for districtwide responsibilities and repercussions, we can look forward to more active involvement of *all* personnel in the implementation of programs.

REFERENCES

Bacharach, S. (Ed.). (1990). *Education reform: Making sense of it all.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Baez, T. (1993). *Protecting the rights of national origin language minority students during the implementation of race desegregation plans.* Milwaukee, WI: University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Center for Urban Community Development.

Boyer, E. (1990). What to teach, how to teach it, and to whom: The new agenda for the nation's schools. In S. Bacharach (Ed.), *Education reform: Making sense of it all.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Crawford, J. (1989). *Bilingual education: History, politics, theory, and practice.* Trenton, NJ: Crane Publishing Company, Inc.

Development Associates, Inc. (1993). *Special issues analysis center: Literature review of federally funded studies related to LEP students, final analytic report.* Arlington, VA: Author.

Fullan, M. (1990). *The meaning of educational change.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Ginsburg, A. (1992). Improving bilingual education programs through evaluation. In *Proceedings of the second national research symposium on limited English proficient student issues: Focus on evaluation and measurement* (pp. 31-42). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs.

Griego-Jones, T. (1990). "School district personnel's perceptions of change." *Journal of School Research and Information,* 8 (1), 33-38.

Lucas, T., Katz, A., and Ramage, K. (1992). *Successful capacity building: An analysis of twenty case studies.* Oakland, CA: ARC Associates.

Martin, J. (1992). *The school home.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Mertens, J., Bateman, P., and Tallmadge, K. (1990). *Descriptive evaluations of the transition program for refugee children and the emergency immigrant education program: Data collection, sampling, and analysis plan.* Washington, DC: Cosmos Corporation.

Nava, E., Reisner, E., Douglas, D., Johnson, D., Morales, M., Tallmadge, G., and Gadsden, V. (1984). *Descriptive analysis of title VII-funded state education agency activities. Volume II: Nine case studies.* Arlington, VA: SRA Technologies; Policy Studies Associates.

Ovando, C., and Collier, V. (1985). *Bilingual and ESL classrooms: Teaching in multicultural contexts.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Pena, A. (1986). *Implementation procedures in bilingual education: The differences between success and failure.* Paper presented at the Conference of the National Association of Bilingual Education, Chicago, IL.

Prager, K. (1991, Fall). "Hidden supports in school restructuring." *Issues in Restructuring Schools,* Rep. No. 1, p. 1; pp. 12-15. Madison, WI: Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools.

Ramirez, J., Yuen, S., and Ramey, D. (1991). *Executive summary: Final report of the longitudinal study of structured English immersion strategy, early-exit and late-exit transitional bilingual education programs for language-minority children.* San Mateo, CA: Aguirre International.

Sarason, S. (1982). *The culture of the school and the problem of change.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Schorr, L. (1989). *Within our reach.* New York: Doubleday.

Tallmadge, G., Lam, T., and Gamel, N. (1987). *Evaluation of bilingual education programs for language-minority, limited English proficiency students: A status report with recommendations for future development (Phase I Report).* Mountain View, CA: RMC Research Corporation.

U.S. Department of Education. (1994). *An idea book: Implementing schoolwide projects.* Washington, DC: Author.

Valdivieso, R. (1991). At-risk students: Hispanic students and reform. In K. Kershner and J. Connolly (Eds.), *At-risk students and school restructuring.* Philadelphia, PA: Research for Better Schools.

Willig, A. (1985). "A meta-analysis of selected studies on the effectiveness of bilingual education." *Review of Educational Research,* 55 (3), 269-317.

OTHER TITLES AVAILABLE FROM NCBE

NCBE Focus Occasional Papers and Program Information Guides cost $3.50 per copy. To order any of the titles listed, circle their number(s), provide the information requested, and detach and mail this page, along with your check or purchase order, to: **NCBE Orders, 1118 22nd Street, NW, Washington, DC 20037.**

detach here

FOCUS OCCASIONAL PAPERS

10. ***For all students: Limited English proficient students and Goals 2000.*** D. August with K. Hakuta & D. Pompa, 1994.
9. ***Bilingual education: A look to the year 2000.*** G. N. Garcia, 1994.
8. ***Distance learning: The challenge for a multicultural society.*** A. Barrera, 1993.
7. ***School readiness and language minority students: Implications of the first National Education Goal.*** C. D. Prince & L. A. Lawrence, 1993.
6. ***Re-thinking the education of teachers of language minority children: Developing reflective teachers for changing schools.*** R. Milk et al., 1992.
5. ***Programs for secondary LEP students: A California study.*** C. Minicucci & L. Olsen, 1992.
4. ***Teaching and testing achievement: The role of language development.*** M. Saville-Troike, 1991.
3. ***Bilingual education: A focus on current research.*** S. D. Krashen, 1991.
2. ***Early childhood programs for language minority children.*** H. Nissani, 1990.
1. ***Bilingualism and bilingual education: A research perspective.*** K. Hakuta, 1990.

PROGRAM INFORMATION GUIDES

20. ***Reconstructing the bilingual special education interface.*** L. Baca & J. S. de Valenzuela, 1994.
19. ***Working with English language learners: Strategies for elementary and middle school teachers.*** A. M. Zehler, 1994.
18. ***Whole-school bilingual education programs: Approaches for sound assessment.*** A. Del Vecchio et al., 1994.
17. ***Family literacy for language minority families: Issues for program implementation.*** M. Mulhern, E. Rodriguez-Brown & T. Shanahan, 1994.
16. ***Multicultural education: Strategies for linguistically diverse schools and classrooms.*** D. Menkart, 1993.
15. ***Reforming mathematics instruction for ESL literacy students.*** K. Buchanan & M. Helman, 1993.
14. ***Applying elements of effective secondary schooling for language minority students.*** T. Lucas, 1993.
13. ***The Literacy Club: A cross-age tutoring/paired reading project.*** B. Cook & C. Urzua, 1993.
12. ***Cooperative learning in the secondary school: Maximizing language acquisition, academic achievement, and social development.*** D. Holt, B. Chips & D. Wallace, 1992.
11. ***Teaching science to English learners, Grades 4-8.*** A. Fathman, M. Quinn & C. Kessler, 1992.
10. ***Writer's workshop and children acquiring English as a non-native language.*** K. Davies Samway, 1992.
9. ***Performance and portfolio assessment for language minority students.*** L. Valdez Pierce & J. Michael O'Malley, 1992.
8. ***The Newcomer Program: Helping immigrant students succeed in U.S. schools.*** M. Friedlander, 1991.
7. ***Integrating language and content instruction: Strategies and techniques.*** D. J. Short, 1991.
6. ***Fostering home-school cooperation: Involving language minority families as partners in education.*** E. Violand-Sanchez, C. P. Sutton & H. W. Ware, 1991.
5. ***School based management: What bilingual and ESL program directors should know.*** D. McKeon & L. Malarz, 1991.
4. ***Using interpreters and translators to meet the needs of handicapped language minority students and their families.*** S. H. Fradd & D. K. Wilen, 1990.
3. ***Informal assessment in evaluation of educational programs: Implications for bilingual education programs.*** C. Navarrete et al., 1990.
2. ***Integrating learning styles and skills in the ESL classroom: An approach to lesson planning.*** E. Violand Hainer et al., 1990.

ORDER INFORMATION

Name: _____

Address: _____

_____

Phone: _____

_____ **ORDER TOTAL**

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Toni Griego Jones is Associate Dean of the School of Education at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. She is also Associate Professor in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction and has been director of the Bilingual Teacher Education Program there for the past seven years. She was formerly a bilingual classroom teacher and administrator in the Denver Public Schools.

ED OBEMLA 95-2

FOCUS

IMPLEMENTING BILINGUAL PROGRAMS IS EVERYBODY'S BUSINESS

Until now, implementation of bilingual programs in most districts has generally been regarded as the business of designated bilingual personnel only, primarily teachers and program directors. Those not directly involved in the delivery of bilingual instruction or administration of programs have not usually taken responsibility for implementing them. Moreover, program implementation has not typically been a districtwide concern. District personnel as a whole generally do not know the program goals and needs and have not considered it part of their job to participate in the implementation of bilingual programs. Thinking of bilingual education as a *districtwide* or *schoolwide* reform effort involves changes in the traditional roles of school personnel and mandates thoughtful attention on how to involve all participants.

Implementing Bilingual Programs Is Everybody's Business discusses the status of bilingual program implementation to date; highlights factors affecting the effective implementation of *districtwide* bilingual education programs as found in the education literature on change, reform, and implementation; and identifies six factors facilitating involvement of non-bilingual personnel in the planning and implementation of bilingual education programs on a *districtwide* scale. Suggested activities for developing an inclusive implementation plan are included.

NCBE

National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education
1118 22nd Street NW ▲ Washington DC 20037